

Title	Evolutionary relationships among bullhead sharks (Chondrichthyes, Heterodontiformes)
Authors	Slater, Tiffany S.;Ashbrook, Kate
Publication date	2020-02-16
Original Citation	Slater, T. S., Ashbrook, K. and Kriwet, J. (2020) 'Evolutionary relationships among bullhead sharks (Chondrichthyes, Heterodontiformes)', Papers in Palaeontology, 6(3), pp. 425-437. doi: 10.1002/spp2.1299
Type of publication	Article (peer-reviewed)
Link to publisher's version	https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/full/10.1002/spp2.1299 - 10.1002/spp2.1299
Rights	© The Palaeontological Association 2020. This is the peer reviewed version of the following article: Slater, T.S., Ashbrook, K. and Kriwet, J. (2020), Evolutionary relationships among bullhead sharks (Chondrichthyes, Heterodontiformes). Pap Palaeontol, 6: 425-437, which has been published in final form at https://doi.org/10.1002/spp2.1299 . This article may be used for non-commercial purposes in accordance with Wiley Terms and Conditions for Self-Archiving.
Download date	2023-05-05 02:59:49
Item downloaded from	http://hdl.handle.net/10468/10339



UCC

University College Cork, Ireland
 Coláiste na hOllscoile Corcaigh



Evolutionary relationships among bullhead sharks (Chondrichthyes: Heterodontiformes)

Journal:	<i>Palaeontology</i>
Manuscript ID	PALA-06-19-4532-OA.R1
Manuscript Type:	Original Article
Date Submitted by the Author:	n/a
Complete List of Authors:	Slater, Tiffany; University of Worcester, School of Science and the Environment; University College Cork, School of Biological, Earth and Environmental Sciences Ashbrook, Kate; University of Worcester, School of Science and the Environment Kriwet, Juergen; University of Vienna, Department of Paleontology
Key words:	Heterodontus, elasmobranch evolution, Paracestracionidae, morphology, bullhead sharks, Late Jurassic

SCHOLARONE™
Manuscripts

Evolutionary relationships among bullhead sharks (Chondrichthyes: Heterodontiformes)

by TIFFANY S. SLATER^{1,2*}, KATE ASHBROOK¹, and JÜRGEN KRIWET³

¹School of Science and the Environment, University of Worcester, Worcester WR2 6AJ, UK; e-mail: k.ashbrook@worc.ac.uk

²Current address: School of Biological, Earth and Environmental Sciences, University College Cork, Distillery Fields, North Mall, Cork T23 TK30, Ireland; e-mail: tiffany.slater@ucc.ie

³ University of Vienna, Department of Palaeontology, Althanstraße 14, Wien 1090, Austria; e-mail: juergen.kriwet@univie.ac.at

*Corresponding author

Abstract: The evolution of modern sharks, skates and rays (Elasmobranchii) is largely enigmatic due to their possession of a labile cartilaginous skeleton; consequently, taxonomic assignment often depends on isolated teeth. Bullhead sharks (Heterodontiformes) are a group of basal neoselachians, thus their remains and relationships are integral to understanding elasmobranch evolution. Here we fully describe †*Paracestracion danieli* – a bullhead shark from the Late Jurassic plattenkalks of Eichstätt, Germany (150–154 Ma) – for its inclusion in cladistic analyses (employing parsimonious principles) using morphological characters from complete †*Paracestracion* and *Heterodontus* fossil specimens as well as extant forms of the latter. Results confirm the presence of two separate monophyletic clades within Heterodontiformes based on predominantly non-dental characters, which show a strong

divergence in body morphology between †*Paracestracion* and *Heterodontus* (the latter possessing a first dorsal fin and pectoral fins that are placed more anterior and pelvic fins that are placed more posterior). This study emphasizes the importance of including non-dental features in heterodontiform systematics (as compared to the use of dental characters alone) and supports the erection of the family †Paracestracionidae. Further, phylogenetic analysis of molecular data from five extant species suggests that crown heterodontiforms arose from a diversification event 42.58 Ma off the west coast of the Americas.

Key words: elasmobranch evolution, Late Jurassic, Paracestracionidae, *Heterodontus*, morphology, bullhead sharks

CHONDRICHTHYANS have a very long evolutionary history with their earliest fossil evidence from the Upper Ordovician (Andreev *et al.* 2015). The cartilaginous fishes include the Holocephali, or modern chimaeroids (Maisey 2012), and the Elasmobranchii (sensu Maisey 2012; = Neoselachii of Compagno 1977), i.e. the modern sharks, skates and rays, which experienced rapid diversification in the Jurassic period and are the predominant group of living chondrichthyans (Kriwet *et al.* 2009a). Morphological and molecular studies support two major monophyletic shark clades within Elasmobranchii: the Galeomorphii and the Squalomorphii (Carvalho & Maisey 1996; Maisey *et al.* 2004; Winchell *et al.* 2004; Human *et al.* 2006; Mallatt & Winchell 2007; Naylor *et al.* 2012). Although both groups are well represented in the fossil record, their labile cartilaginous skeleton leads to a taphonomic bias towards isolated teeth (Kriwet & Klug 2008). Consequently, much of the early evolutionary history of elasmobranchs is either highly contested or unknown (Klug 2010).

1
2
3 51 Bullhead sharks (Heterodontiformes) are the most plesiomorphic galeomorphs (Naylor *et*
4
5 52 *al.* 2012), with their remains first appearing in the Early Jurassic (*c.* 175 Ma).
6
7 53 Heterodontiforms are therefore among the oldest groups in the fossil record for modern
8
9 54 sharks and have the potential to provide insight into early elasmobranch evolution (Thies
10
11 55 1983; Maisey 2012). Several genera of Heterodontiformes seemingly evolved in the
12
13 56 Jurassic (Kriwet 2008, Hovestadt 2018): †*Proheterodontus*, †*Palaeoheterodontus*,
14
15 57 †*Procestracion* and †*Paracestracion* (all represented by isolated teeth and the last also by
16
17 58 complete specimens) disappear from the fossil record before the Cretaceous, while
18
19 59 *Heterodontus* underwent further radiation and still occupies our waters today (Kriwet
20
21 60 2008). †*Protoheterodontus* briefly appears in the Campanian (Guinot *et al.* 2013,
22
23 61 Hovestadt 2018) but did not make a significant contribution to Late Cretaceous
24
25 62 biodiversity.
26
27 63
28
29 64 Bullhead sharks possess a durotrophic littoral ecomorphotype and are characterized by a
30
31 65 distinct heterodont dentition with cuspidate anterior teeth to grab invertebrate prey and
32
33 66 robust and flattened posterior teeth to crush armoured prey items or small bony fish (Strong
34
35 67 1989; Maia *et al.* 2012). The Eichstätt and Solnhofen areas in southern Germany (and
36
37 68 Dover in the U.K.) formed part of an archipelago in the Jurassic that was surrounded by
38
39 69 shallow waters of the Tethys Sea (Kriwet & Klug 2008), which likely promoted allopatric
40
41 70 speciation in heterodontiforms (Cuny & Benton 1999). Understanding the evolutionary
42
43 71 history and past taxonomic diversity of elasmobranchs, however, is encumbered by
44
45 72 preservation and collecting biases (Guinot & Cavin 2015).
46
47 73
48
49 74 Completely articulated specimens of elasmobranchs are of utmost importance because they
50
51 75 provide abundant anatomical characters for exact taxonomic identification and can inform
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

on morphological, ontogenetic and ecological adaptive changes in their evolution. Here we provide a formal description of †*Paracestracion danieli* – a subadult specimen from the Tithonian of Eichstätt, Germany (150–154 Ma) that was previously identified as a new species (Slater 2016).

Relationships within Heterodontiformes have received surprisingly little attention despite their important phylogenetic position (Maisey 1982, 2012), with recent work including only dental characters (Hovestadt 2018). Anatomical characters from †*Paracestracion* and *Heterodontus* fossils, as well as extant species from the latter, were used in cladistic analyses to examine the evolutionary relationships within heterodontiforms. Taxa based on teeth alone were not included here and, despite recent advances (Hovestadt 2018), their validity remains untested. A taxonomic diversity analysis based solely on extinct and extant heterodontid dentition was, however, performed using data from Hovestadt (2018) and Reif (1976) for comparison. Additionally, the phylogenetic relationships of extant *Heterodontus* were investigated using molecular data from five species. Elucidation of the interrelationships of heterodontiforms will help inform key questions regarding the biodiversity and evolutionary history of heterodontiforms.

MATERIAL AND METHODS

Taxonomic analysis of †Paracestracion danieli

Ultraviolet light was used to expose delicate fossil structures in †*Paracestracion danieli*.

High-resolution casts were made of significant anatomical features, such as teeth and placoid scales, which were photographed using a KEYENCE 3D Digital VHX-600 microscope.

Multivariate statistical analysis of heterodontids

Seven distance measurements were taken from †*Paracestracion danieli*, †*P. falcifer* (AS-VI-505), extant juveniles of *H. japonicus*, *H. zebra*, *H. portusjacksoni* and two adult *H. japonicus* to identify differences in body shape between genera (Slater *et al.* 2019, table S1, S2). Measurements taken were total body length, length between the anterior and posterior dorsal fin, length between posterior dorsal fin and caudal fin, distance between the pectoral fin and pelvic fin, length between the pelvic fin and anal fin, and widths of the pectoral and pelvic girdle. Distance measurements were corrected for allometry in the software package PAST v.3.20 (Hammer *et al.* 2001) and a Principal Components Analysis (PCA) was performed.

Cladistic analysis of heterodontiforms

Three extant species of *Heterodontus* and fossil specimens of †*Paracestracion*, *Heterodontus* and †*Palaeospinax* – a stem-group representative of Elasmobranchii used to polarize characters (Klug 2010) – were examined to create a robust character matrix (Harvey & Pagel 1991; see Slater *et al.* 2019 for information on specimens used in this study). Morphological trait analysis was carried out using the protocol from Klug (2010). Irrelevant and particularly labile characters were removed and characters specific to Heterodontiformes were added: two cranial (#96, 103), 15 postcranial (#94, 97–102, 104–112), two fin spine (#93, 113), 13 dental (#76–80, 83–84, 86–91) and one denticle character (#92).

A total of 113 characters were used to create a character matrix in the software program Mesquite v.3.51 (Maddison & Maddison 2018). Morphological characters from †*Palidiplospinax* were all coded as [0] (Klug 2010). Soft tissue characters were removed from the matrix prior to analysis and characters that were not applicable to a specimen

(such as the presence of molariform teeth in juvenile heterodontids or in the absence of preservation) were coded as [?]. Parsimonious approaches were used in the software program PAUP* v4.0 and 1000 replicates were performed using the heuristic search mode by stepwise addition to obtain bootstrap values (Felsenstein 1985; Swafford 2002). All characters were treated with equal weight. Both ACCTRAN and DELTRAN algorithms were used as they assign character changes as closely as possible to the nodes and tips, respectively (Agnarsson & Miller 2008). Sixty phylogenetically uninformative and/or constant characters were removed (#1–17, 19–26, 28, 30–39, 42–48, 50–51, 53–57, 62, 64–65, 67, 70, 73, 75–76, 104, 112).

Taxonomic diversity analysis

The standing diversity of heterodontiforms was determined for species presented in Hovestadt (2018). Genera of ambiguous systematic position within Heterodontiformes were omitted and 95% confidence intervals (CI) were calculated to obtain a measure for the significance of results. We also consider the stratigraphic distribution of the two dental morphotypes proposed for extant and extinct heterodontiforms by Reif (1976) and Hovestadt (2018).

Molecular phylogeny of extant heterodontids

Homologous NADH2 mitochondrial gene sequences for *Chimaera phantasma* (accession number JQ518719.1), *Torpedo fuscomaculata* (JQ518934.1), *Raja montagui* (JQ518886.1), *Heterodontus galeatus* (JQ518722.1), *H. portusjacksoni* (JQ519033.1), *H. zebra* (KF927894.1), *H. mexicanus* (JQ519166.1) and *H. francisci* (JQ519165.1) were aligned using ClustalW in MEGA v7.0 (Kumar *et al.* 2016). *C. phantasma* was used as the outgroup and a maximum likelihood phylogeny was produced using a GTR+Γ model and an analytical

1

2

3151variance estimation with nucleotide substitutions and a strong branch swap filter. Gaps and

4

5152missing data were treated as complete deletions and 1000 bootstrap replications were

6

7

8153executed. A time tree was constructed using a local clock and a minimum and maximum

9

10154divergence date between Rajiformes and Torpediniformes (187.8–209 Ma) for calibration

11

12155(Inoue *et al.* 2010; Aschliman *et al.* 2012).

13

14

15

16156

17

18157**GEOGRAPHICAL AND GEOLOGICAL SETTING**

19

20158†*Paracestracion danieli* (PBP-SOL-0005) was excavated from the Solnhofen limestone

21

22

23159(ca. 153 Ma, early Tithonian, Late Jurassic) near Eichstätt (South Germany; Fig. 1). The

24

25160fossil-yielding layers consist of finely laminated and strongly silicified calcarenites and

26

27161calcsiltites (for information about the geology and geography of this area see Kriwet &

28

29162Klug 2004).

30

31

32163

33

34164*Institutional abbreviations.* BSPG, Bayerische Staatssammlung für Paläontologie und

35

36165Geologie Munich, Germany; JME, Jura Museum Eichstätt, Germany; SMNS, State

37

38166Museum of Natural History Stuttgart, Germany; PBP-SOL, Wyoming Dinosaur Center,

39

40167USA.

41

42

43168

44

45169**SYSTEMATIC PALAEONTOLOGY**

46

47

48170Superclass CHONDRICHTHYES Huxley, 1880

49

50171Class ELASMOBRANCHII Bonaparte, 1838

51

52172Cohort EUSELACHII Hay, 1902

53

54173Subcohort NEOSELACHII Compagno, 1977

55

56

57174Superorder GALEOMORPHII Compagno, 1973

58

59175Order HETERODONTIFORMES Berg, 1940

60

176 Family PARACESTRACIONIDAE

177 *LSID*. urn:lsid:zoobank.org:act:XXXXXXXXXX

178

179 Genus †PARACESTRACION Koken, in Zittel, 1911

180

181 *Type species*. †*Cestracion falcifer* Wagner, 1857 (BSPG AS-VI-505); lower Tithonian of

182 Solnhofen, South Germany.

183

184 †*Paracestracion danieli*

185 Figure 2

186

187 *Derivation of name*. Named in honour of J. Frank Daniel for his work on the endoskeleton of

188 *extant* heterodontiform sharks.

189

190 *Holotype*. PBP-SOL-0005, complete specimen preserved in part and counterpart.

191

192 *Diagnosis*. †*P. danieli* is characterized by the following combination of plesiomorphic and

193 autapomorphic (indicated by an asterisk) morphological traits: *labial* ornamentation on

194 *anterior teeth*; absence of distal curvature in parasymphyseal teeth; pectoral girdle positioned

195 at the 12th vertebra*; and first dorsal fin spine placed at the 32nd and 33rd vertebrae*.

196

197 *Description*. The part and counterpart of †*P. danieli* display organic preservation of the body

198 shape and a complete and fully articulated cartilaginous skeleton (Fig. 2A–B). The paired fins

199 are represented by a single fin each: the pectoral fin is ovular in shape (i.e. possesses no

200 distinct margins) and is most broad near its trailing edge, while the pelvic fin – ventral to the

201 anterior dorsal fin and abutting the pectoral fin – is pointed at both its apex and free rear tip
202 and has an anterior and posterior margin of similar length. The anterior dorsal fin (height, 23
203 mm; length, 40.4 mm) is larger than the posterior (height, 25.9 mm; length, 30.2 mm) but
204 both possess a rounded apex and a gently curved posterior margin. The anal fin is ventral to
205 the posterior dorsal fin, is its own length to the caudal fin and is pointed at its apex. A pointed
206 ventral tip joins the pre- and postventral margin of the caudal fin, with the postventral margin
207 extending dorsocaudally to a ventral posterior tip. The dorsal lobe predominates the caudal
208 fin, whereby the upper postventral margin continues anterodorsally to a broad subterminal
209 notch. The posterior margin and the dorsal posterior ‘tip’ are rounded and possess no distinct
210 boundaries.

212 A dense layer of denticles obstructs the view of the neurocranium. The hyomandibula, hyoid
213 and branchial apparatus are embedded in sediment. Segments of the Meckel’s cartilage join at
214 the symphysis to form a bulbous rostrum and then extend in a posterolateral fashion (Fig. 2C).
215 One mandible segment is fully exposed in lateral view and maintains a similar height along its
216 entire length; the posterior end does not possess a strong process but is negatively cambered
217 (i.e. the ventral margin extends more laterally than the dorsal margin) before it curves
218 dorsally to form the quadrato-mandibular joint. Features of the palatoquadrate are obscured
219 by sediment. Two dorsal fin spines are positioned directly anterior to each dorsal fin (Fig.
220 3A–B). The posterior fin spine is larger and more recurved than the anterior and the caps of
221 each bear no tuberculation. Skeletal features such as the propterygium, mesopterygium and
222 metapterygium are visible, however much of their features are embedded in the sediment.
223 Supraneural elements are present and are along the posterior end of the caudal fin.

225 Exposed teeth on the Meckel’s cartilage are preserved *in situ* and are symmetrical and possess

226 a gentle slope. Three small, lateral cusps flank each side of a large, central cusp – all of which
227 possess distinct vertical striations on their labial face (Fig. 2D–F). The pair of cusps most
228 proximal to the central cusp are well developed when compared to the other cusplets. The
229 cusps are not lingually bent and the lateral and posterior teeth are not distally inclined.
230 Anterior teeth are taller than they are wide and exhibit a slightly convex basal labial edge that
231 juts out over the crown/root junction (Fig. 2E–F). Lateral teeth are wider than they are tall,
232 and the basal labial edge is less prominent than in anterior teeth (Fig. 2D). No molariform
233 teeth are present, which supports that the specimen is subadult. The root is gently curved in
234 basal view and the vascularisation is of the holaulacorhize type. Single, circular nutritive
235 foramina are located in the centre of a nutritive groove, which divides the root into two lobes
236 (Fig. 2G). No nutritive foramina are visible on the lateral faces of the root lobes.

238 The most rostral part of the cranium is densely covered in denticles that are preserved in
239 apical view and have a slightly convex crown surface and a wide posterior margin that gently
240 tapers to a rounded anterior tip (Fig. 2H). Denticle crowns on the rest of the cranium possess
241 (in apical view) a delicate mid-ridge and an arrow-like morphology that is nearly as wide as it
242 is long (Fig. 2I); the ventral side of the body is flanked with denticles of similar morphology
243 but are longer than they are wide (and thus are more pointed at their apex) and have a more
244 prominent mid-ridge in apical aspect (Fig. 2J). Denticles along the anterior margins of the
245 paired fins are again arrow-like in shape but have a weak mid-ridge and a much shorter ‘stem’
246 than cranial and ventral denticles (Fig. 2K). Many dorsal denticles possess the same
247 morphology as those on the ventral side of the body; some, however, are thorn-like in apical
248 view (Fig. 3C). Anterior to the fin spines are dorsal thorns, which – unlike denticles – sit
249 perpendicular to the body, are slightly concave in lateral view and have a broad base that
250 tapers to a sharp, recurved apex (Fig. 3D).

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

251

252

253

254

255

256

257

258

259

260

261

262

263

264

265

266

267

268

269

270

271

272

273

274

Occurrence. Late Jurassic (Tithonian, ca. 153 Ma).

RESULTS

Comparison and multivariate statistical analysis of meristic characters

†*Paracestracion danieli* is characterized by seven cusps in anterior teeth at a body length of 225 mm while the holotype of †*P. falcifer* (AS-VI-505) exhibits a single cusp in anterior teeth at a body length of 400mm (Fig. 4). The position of various features along the body column (e.g. at the *n*th vertebrae) are markedly different between †*P. danieli* and †*P. falcifer*: the dorsal fin spines in the former (anterior: 32nd–33rd; posterior: 62nd–63rd) – as well as the pectoral and pelvic girdle (12th and 32nd, respectively) – are placed more posterior along the body when compared to †*P. falcifer* (anterior fin spine: 23rd–24th; posterior fin spine: 43rd–44th; pectoral and pelvic girdle: 10th and 24th, respectively; Slater 2016, table 1). This is confirmed by multivariate statistical analysis, which reveals that the distance between the pectoral and pelvic fins accounts for the majority of the variation (PC1=78.9%) in body shape between †*P. danieli*, †*P. falcifer* as well as extant species of *Heterodontus*: the distance between the posterior dorsal and caudal fin (PC2) explain 15.9% of the variation (Fig. 5).

Cladistic analysis of heterodontiforms

The cladistic analysis produced one most parsimonious tree with a tree length of 61, a consistency index of 0.9016 (indicating a low amount of homoplasy in the dataset) and a retention index of 0.9062 (indicating that the proportion of terminal taxa retaining the character identified as a synapomorphy is high). Unless specified, characters were assigned to nodes and terminal taxa by both ACCTRAN and DELTRAN optimizations. Results from

our analysis support two monophyletic groups, a clade that includes †*Paracestracion* species and one that contains extinct and extant forms of *Heterodontus* (Fig. 6).

Characters supporting the monophyly of node B are the presence of a root shelf that surrounds the entire circumference of the tooth (likely anchoring them in the mucosal tissue), pelvic fins that are ventral to the first dorsal fin and, as assigned by ACCTRAN optimization, abutting the pectorals (Fig. 6). The vertebrae above which the first dorsal fin spine is inserted is considered an autapomorphic character for †*P. viohli*, †*P. falcifer* and †*P. danieli* (22–23rd, 24–25th and 32–33rd vertebrae, respectively).

Node C is characterized by pelvic fins that abut the pectorals and seven cusps on the symphyseal teeth as a juvenile, which are both supported by DELTRAN optimization. Specimen SMNS 11150 is identified as a separate species from †*P. falcifer* due to the presence of five cusps on its anterior teeth as a juvenile (ACCTRAN optimization; Fig. S1). †*Paracestracion viohli* (JME Sha 728) is characterized by ornamentation on the lingual tooth crown face and a lack thereof on the labial face in anterior teeth.

Node D features dorsal thorns (DELTRAN optimization) and an absence of distal curvature in the parasymphyseal teeth of juveniles. †*Paracestracion danieli* features an additional two characters: a pectoral girdle at the 12th vertebra and the aforementioned position of the first dorsal fin spine.

Node E identifies a monophyletic clade that is supported by a low number of tooth families (≤ 21) (ACCTRAN optimization), an absence of labial tooth crown ornamentation in anterior teeth, an anal fin that is more than its own length in distance to the caudal fin and a

1
2
3 300 pectoral girdle positioned at the eighth vertebrae. †*Heterodontus zitteli* features accessory
4
5 301 cusplets that are nearly the same height as the central cusp and – as in †*P. danieli* – dorsal
6
7 302 thorns (DELTRAN optimization) and seven cusps on the anterior teeth (DELTRAN
8
9
10 303 optimization).
11
12 304
13
14 305 Node F features an absence of a horizontal root on the basal face of anterior teeth, labial
15
16 306 faces of the crown that jut out over the crown/root junction, anterior teeth with a convex
17
18 307 labial face, absence of a cylindrical central cusp, presence of a medio-lingual protuberance,
19
20 308 and an absence of fin spine tuberculation. Additional characters are identifiable when
21
22 309 ACCTTRAN optimization is used: an anal fin that is posterior to the second dorsal fin,
23
24 310 absence of dorsal thorns, pectoral fins that are entirely situated anterior to the first dorsal
25
26 311 fin, and a high number of vertebral centra. DELTRAN optimization also identifies a low
27
28 312 number of tooth rows to this node. †*Heterodontus canaliculatus* is recognized by
29
30 313 ACCTTRAN as having three cusps in adult anterior teeth.
31
32 314
33
34
35 315 Node G is exclusive to extant *Heterodontus* and shows a relationship between species
36
37 316 occupying shallow waters off of the coasts of Australia and the east coast of Asia.
38
39 317 Characters for node G include: two root lobes are inclined and join in the midline of the
40
41 318 lingual side of the tooth, broad molariform teeth with no median crest on the cutting edge
42
43 319 in adults, an anal fin that is posterior to the second dorsal fin, pectoral fins that are not
44
45 320 situated anterior to the first dorsal fin, a low number of vertebrae and a single cusp in adult
46
47 321 anterior teeth (the last of which is supported by DELTRAN optimization). *Heterodontus*
48
49 322 *portusjacksoni* has enameloid ridges on molariformes, a less pronounced supraorbital crest,
50
51 323 and five cusps in juvenile anterior teeth (the last is supported by ACCTTRAN optimization).
52
53 324 *H. japonicus*, conversely, has seven cusps in juvenile anterior teeth.
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

325

326 *Taxonomic diversity of heterodontiforms*

327 Analysis of data from Hovestadt (2018) shows that the standing taxonomic diversity of

328 fossil heterodontiforms increased from the Early to the Late Jurassic, followed by a 1.7%

329 decrease in species across the Jurassic/Cretaceous boundary (Table 1). The Late

330 Cretaceous represents 26.3% of the total extinct and extant taxonomic diversity for

331 heterodontiforms, with the Cenomanian accounting for most species. Further, an 8.8%

332 decrease in species standing diversity occurs across the K/Pg boundary but is not

333 significant. The Palaeogene represents 17.5% of the total diversity of fossil and extant

334 heterodontiforms, while the Neogene represents 12.3%. Three and six extant species

335 display dental structures of morphotype 1 and 2, respectively.

336

337 *Molecular phylogeny of extant Heterodontus*338 Results indicate that *H. francisci* – originating ca. 42.58 Ma – is basal to all other extant339 heterodontids included in our analysis and that *H. mexicanus* and *H. zebra* diverged from *H.*340 *francisci* ca. 27.67 Ma and 9.22 Ma, respectively (Fig. 7). *H. portusjacksoni* and *H. galeatus*

341 are shown to have diverged from each other 7.14 Ma. The low bootstrap support value,

342 however, indicates that their relationships remain unresolved.

343

344 **DISCUSSION**345 *Comparison of Heterodontidae and †Paracestracionidae*346 Cladistic analysis and comparison of dental and non-dental features between *Heterodontus*347 and †*Paracestracion* supports the necessity for a family – †*Paracestracionidae* – to include

348 all extinct forms of the latter.

349

350 *Post-cranial features.* Our findings emphasize the differences in body morphology between
 351 Heterodontidae and †Paracestracionidae and characterizes the latter as having pelvic fins that
 352 are placed more anterior as well as a first dorsal fin that is placed more posterior – two key
 353 features that are possessed by slow swimming epibenthic and benthic sharks (Figs 5, 6; Maia
 354 *et al.* 2012). In contrast, traits that are generally associated with a more active lifestyle, such
 355 as a (1) first dorsal fin and associated fin spine that are placed more anterior (2) pelvic girdle
 356 and fins that are placed more posterior and (3) pectoral girdle that is placed more anterior,
 357 are most clearly manifested in the Heterodontidae. The Late Jurassic culminated in a
 358 radiation in teleosts (Arratia 2004) as well as marine transgressions and minor mass
 359 extinctions that primarily affected coastal reef habitats (Hallam 1981, 1990, 2001; Moore &
 360 Ross 1994), which would have led to an increase in competition; it is plausible that the body
 361 morphology of *Heterodontus* contributed to their persistence into the Cretaceous, unlike
 362 *Paracestracion*.
 363
 364 †*Paracestracion* has previously been defined by the position of the pelvic fins, whereby they
 365 abut the pectorals and sit below the first dorsal fin (Kriwet *et al.* 2009b). Interestingly, the
 366 first dorsal fin spine's position along the vertebral column unambiguously distinguishes †*P.*
 367 *falcifer* and †*P. danieli*. Although this is also an autapomorphic character for †*P. vlohli*
 368 sexual dimorphism cannot be ruled out (compare Daniel 1915) due to its missing posterior
 369 end and is therefore only characterized by its dental ornamentation in this study. Further, †*P.*
 370 *falcifer* (the holotype) and †*P. danieli* possess thorns. This trait, however, is also present in
 371 †*H. zitteli* and similar structures present in juvenile angel sharks are lost as they age
 372 (Compagno 2001). Investigation of the presence/absence of dorsal thorns in undoubtedly
 373 adult heterodontiforms is thus necessary to determine if it is an ontogenetic or a homoplastic
 374 feature.

375

376 *Dentition.* This study identifies an additional key characteristic of †Paracestracionidae to

377 those of previous studies (Kriwet *et al.* 2009b): teeth exhibit a root shelf whereas in

378 Heterodontidae the root lobes meet in the midline of the tooth and form a lingual

379 protuberance. Additionally, the rate at which the number of cusps is reduced throughout

380 ontogeny in extant Heterodontidae is very gradual when compared to †Paracestracionidae

381 (Reif 1976; Fig. 3). The Meckel's cartilage and palatoquadrate in extant juveniles contains

382 13–17 and 17–21 tooth families, respectively (Reif 1976), while †*P. danieli* possesses 21 and

383 23 families, respectively, and the holotype for †*P. falcifer* possesses 29 on the palatoquadrate:

384 this may indicate a major difference in feeding ecology between Heterodontidae and

385 †Paracestracionidae (Slater 2016). Further studies on the ontogeny of heterodonty in

386 Heterodontiformes, however, are required to confidently determine differences in dentition

387 between the two families and examine the impact on their evolutionary fates.

389 *Taxonomy of Heterodontiformes*

390 Extant species of *Heterodontus* are divided into two groups based on tooth morphology (Reif

391 1976): following this concept, Hovestadt (2018) revises extant and extinct heterodontiform

392 systematics and assigns fossil species to either morphotype 1 or 2 (corresponding to the

393 *Portusjacksoni* and *Francisci* group, respectively, of Reif 1976 for extant species) or, if a

394 combination of characters is present, to a new genus. New genera based exclusively on

395 isolated fossil teeth were thus introduced: †*Protoheterodontus* is represented by a single

396 occurrence from the Campanian (Late Cretaceous) of France (Guinot *et al.* 2013),

397 †*Palaeoheterodontus* by a species in the late Late to early Middle Jurassic and

398 †*Procestracion* by a single anterior tooth from the Kimmeridgian of southern Germany

399 (Hovestadt 2018). Further, Hovestadt (2018) assumes †*Cestracion zitteli* to be undiagnosable

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

(*nomina nuda*) due to an absence of preserved dentition and considers †*P. vlohli* Kriwet, 2008 as a non-heterodontiform due to the lack of associated dental characters (p. 90). However, in this study, we show that – in addition to dental features – non-dental characters clearly identify †*Paracestracion zitteli* to represent the most basal member of heterodontids and support the inclusion of †*P. vlohli* in †Paracestracionidae. Ultimately, systematic assignment of heterodontiforms based on dental characters alone is likely to provide ambiguous results due to an absence of data on the ontogeny of heterodonty as well as the prevalence of convergent evolution in elasmobranch dentition. Our study utilizes non-dental features to distinguish several species within the Heterodontiformes and thus highlights the importance of these characters in taxonomic analyses of heterodontiform fossils.

A new Super Order (Paracestrationiformes) and family (Paracestrationidae) was proposed (Jacques and Van Waes 2012) to include all members of the †*Paracestracion* genus however neither was registered. Our study confirms the necessity for the family †Paracestracionidae however we refrain from introducing a new order to include the †Paracestracionidae family due to the restriction of taxa in our analyses, which does not reject the interpretation that both families represent sister groups within Heterodontiformes.

Diversity patterns of heterodontiforms

A 1.7% decrease in species across the Jurassic/Cretaceous boundary is likely due to the limited number of species recorded in the Early Cretaceous, which may be a result of collecting bias: consequently, a significant decrease in heterodontiform diversity across the Jurassic/Cretaceous boundary cannot be unambiguously established. The Late Cretaceous heralds the highest species diversity in the evolutionary history of heterodontiforms however it is unbalanced among the epochs and is generally rather low.

425

426 *Relationships within extant heterodontiforms*

427 *Origins of crown heterodontiforms.* Divergence dates in this study are based on the minimum
428 and maximum divergence dates between Rajiformes and Torpediniformes, which spans
429 187.8–209 Ma. Our estimate that crown heterodontiforms originated with *H. francisci* off the
430 west coast of the Americas ca. 42.58 Ma largely supports a previous estimate of 47 Ma
431 (Sorenson *et al.* 2014). *Heterodontus quoyi* (not included in this study) also occupies waters
432 off the west coast of South America and was previously posited as the most plesiomorphic
433 heterodontid due to the proximity of the anal fin to the caudal fin – as in †*H. zitteli* (Maisey
434 1982). It is therefore critical to obtain molecular information for *H. quoyi* to elucidate the
435 origin of crown heterodontiforms.

436

437 Ultimately, our molecular phylogeny suggests that pre-Eocene – and especially Cretaceous
438 heterodontiforms – represent stem group members. This contrasts with Hovestadt (2018), in
439 which (apart from the absence of morphotype 2 from the Oligocene) both dental morphotypes
440 are present in the Palaeogene, Neogene and the Late Cretaceous (Table 1). If dentitions bear
441 not only a taxonomic but also a phylogenetic signal – which remains to be tested – this would
442 indicate that species resembling modern heterodontiforms evolved in the late Early
443 Cretaceous. Our results are, nevertheless, consistent with the data from Hovestadt (2018) that
444 indicate that morphotype 2 (Francisci group of Reif 1976) is the most plesiomorphic of
445 heterodontiform dentitions. We, however, consider the reconstruction of heterodontid
446 evolution based on dental features alone insufficient: molecular information combined with
447 morphological evidence from complete fossil specimens provides a larger, more robust
448 dataset than one based on dental morphology.

449

1
2
3 450 *Eastern Pacific species*. During the mid-Eocene shallow waters of the Tethys Sea extended to
4
5 451 what are presently the west coasts of the Americas, the east coast of North America and the
6
7 452 Gulf of Mexico and the disparity in the oceanic temperature from the equator to the poles was
8
9 453 reduced (Barron 1987; Sluijs *et al.* 2006; Hines *et al.* 2017): these conditions may have
10
11 454 contributed to the migration and subsequent speciation of heterodontids during the mid-
12
13 455 Eocene due to their strong preference for waters over 21 °C (Compagno 2001).
14
15
16
17 456

18
19 457 *Western Pacific species*. Results also reveal a monophyletic relation for species along the east
20
21 458 Asiatic and Australian coasts (*H. zebra*, *H. portusjacksoni* and *H. galeatus*): future
22
23 459 palaeontological discoveries might clarify the migration routes resulting in the divergence of
24
25 460 these species (as well as those not included in this study along the east coast of Saudi Arabia
26
27 461 and Africa) from those in the Eastern Pacific ca. 9.22 Ma (Ebert *et al.* 2017; Pollom *et al.*
28
29 462 2019). The topology of Western Pacific species in our phylogeny is likely different from that
30
31 463 of Naylor *et al.* (2012) due to their use of Bayesian principles: further, the positions of *H.*
32
33 464 *portusjacksoni* and *H. galeatus* are considered unresolved here.
34
35
36
37 465

40 466 CONCLUSIONS

41
42 467 Anatomical characters from complete bullhead shark fossils support the monophyly of
43
44 468 Heterodontiformes, which can be separated into two families: one including solely extinct
45
46 469 forms of †*Paracestracion* – assigned to †*Paracestracionidae* – and both extinct and extant
47
48 470 forms of *Heterodontus* within the Heterodontidae. Although we recognize the importance of
49
50 471 tooth morphologies in taxonomic analyses the phylogenetic signal of heterodontiform dental
51
52 472 characters requires further investigation. This study emphasizes the importance of using non-
53
54 473 dental features to provide a greater number of informative characters when investigating the
55
56 474 systematics of chondrichthyan fossils.
57
58
59
60

475
476 Molecular phylogenetic analysis reveals that crown heterodontiforms likely originated off the
477 west coast of the Americas due to a diversification event during the mid-Eocene. Further
478 research, however, is required to elucidate the evolutionary history of Heterodontiformes and
479 to clarify migration routes that led to the current distribution of *Heterodontus*.

480

481 *Acknowledgements.* We are grateful for the Palaeontological Association Undergraduate
482 Research Bursary PA-UB201606 that financially supported T.S. on this project. We thank B.
483 Pohl (Wyoming Dinosaur Center), P. Bartsch and J. Klapp (Museum für Naturkunde Berlin)
484 and E. Bernard (London Natural History Museum) for access and assistance with their
485 collections and G. Cuny for useful comments on the manuscript.

486

487 DATA ARCHIVING STATEMENT

488 Data for this study are available in the Dryad Digital Repository:

489 <https://datadryad.org/review?doi=doi:10.5061/dryad.6p4f83q>

490 This published work and the nomenclatural act it contains, have been registered in ZooBank:

491 <http://zoobank.org/References/XXXXXXXXXX>

492

493 REFERENCES

494 AGNARSSON, I. and MILLER, J. A. 2008. Is ACCTRAN better than DELTRAN?
495 *Cladistics*, **24**, 1–7.

496

497 ANDREEV, P. S., COATES, M. I., SHELTON, R. M., COOPER, P. R., SMITH, M. P.,
498 SANSOM and SANSOM, I. J. 2015. Upper Ordovician chondrichthyan-like scales from
499 North America. *Palaeontology*, **58**, 691–704.

- 500
- 501 ARRATIA, G. 2004. Mesozoic halecostomes and the early radiation of teleosts. 279–315. *In*
- 502 ARRATIA, G. and TINTORI, A. (eds.). *Mesozoic Fishes 3 – Systematics, Paleoenvironments*
- 503 *and Biodiversity*. Dr Friedrich Pfeil Verlag, München, 649 pp.
- 504
- 505 ASCHLIMAN, N. C., NISHIDA, M., MIYA, M., INOUE, J. G., ROSANA, K. M.,
- 506 NAYLOR, G. J. 2012. Body plan convergence in the evolution of skates and rays
- 507 (Chondrichthyes: Batoidea). *Molecular Phylogenetics and Evolution*, **63**, 28–42.
- 508
- 509 BARRON, E. J. 1987. Eocene equator-to-pole surface ocean temperatures: a significant
- 510 climate problem? *Palaeoceanography*, **2**, 729–739.
- 511
- 512 BERG, L. S. 1940. Classification of fishes both recent and fossil. *Travaux de l'Institut*
- 513 *Zoologique de l'Académie des Sciences de l'U.R.S.S.*, **5**, 85–517.
- 514
- 515 BONAPARTE, C. L. J. L. 1838. Selachorum tabula analytica. *Nuovi Annali Scienze*
- 516 *Naturali*, **2**, 195–214.
- 517
- 518 CARVALHO, M. R. and MAISEY, J. G. 1996. Phylogenetic relationships of the Late
- 519 Jurassic shark *Protospinax* WOODWARD 1919 (Chondrichthyes: Elasmobranchii). 9–46.
- 520 *In* ARRATIA, G., VIOHL, G. (eds.). *Mesozoic fishes 1 - systematics and paleoecology*. Dr
- 521 Friedrich Pfeil Verlag, München, Germany, 576 pp.
- 522

- 523 COMPAGNO, L. J. V. 1973. Interrelationships of living elasmobranches. 15–61. *In*
524 GREENWOOD, P. H., MILES, R. S. and PATTERSON, C. (eds.). *Interrelationships of*
525 *fishes*. Linnean Society of London, London, 536 pp.
- 526
- 527 — 1977. Phyletic relationships of living sharks and rays. *Integrative and Comparative*
528 *Biology*, **17**, 303–322.
- 529
- 530 — 2001. Sharks of the world: an annotated and illustrated catalogue of shark species known
531 to date. *Volume 2. Bullhead, Mackerel and Carpet sharks (Heterodontiformes, Lamniformes*
532 *and Orectolobiformes)*. Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations, Rome,
533 269 pp.
- 534
- 535 CUNY, G. and BENTON, M. J. 1999. Early radiation of the Neoselachian sharks in Western
536 Europe. *GEOBIOS*, **32**, 193–204.
- 537
- 538 DANIEL, J. F. 1915. The anatomy of *Heterodontus francisci*. II. The endoskeleton. *Journal*
539 *of Morphology*, **26**, 447–493.
- 540
- 541 EBERT, D. A., KHAN, M., VALINASSAB, T., AKHILESH, K. V. and TESFAMICHAEL,
542 D. 2017. *Heterodontus omanensis*. *The IUCN Red List of Threatened Species*.
543 <<http://dx.doi.org/10.2305/IUCN.UK.2017-2.RLTS.T161720A109916524.en>>. Downloaded
544 on 18 June 2018.
- 545
- 546 FELSENSTEIN, J. 1985. Confidence limits on phylogenies: an approach using the bootstrap.
547 *Evolution*, **39**, 783–791.

- 548
- 549 GUINOT, G. and CAVIN, L. 2015. Contrasting “fish” diversity dynamics between marine
- 550 and freshwater environments. *Current Biology*, **25**, 2314–2318.
- 551
- 552 — UNDERWOOD, C., CAPPETTA, H. and WARD, D. 2013. Sharks from the Late
- 553 Cretaceous of France and the U.K. *Journal of Systematic Palaeontology*, **11**, 589–671.
- 554
- 555 HALLAM, A. 1981. The End-Triassic bivalve extinction event. *Palaeogeography,*
- 556 *Palaeoclimatology, Palaeoecology*, **35**, 1–44.
- 557
- 558 — 1990. The end-Triassic mass extinction event. 577–583. *In* SHARPTON, V. L. and
- 559 WARD, P. D. (eds.). *Global catastrophes in Earth history: An interdisciplinary conference*
- 560 *on impacts, volcanism, and mass mortality. Geological Society of America Special Paper*
- 561 **247**, 644 pp.
- 562
- 563 — 2001. A review of the broad pattern of Jurassic sea-level changes and their possible
- 564 causes in the light of current knowledge. *Palaeogeography, Palaeoclimatology,*
- 565 *Palaeoecology*, **167**, 23–37.
- 566
- 567 HAMMER, Ø., HARPER, D. A. T. and RYAN, P. D. 2001. PAST: Palaeontological
- 568 Statistics software package for education and data analysis. *Palaeontologia Electronica*, **4**, 1–
- 569 9.

- 1
2
3 571 HARVEY, P. H. and PAGEL, M. D. 1991. *The comparative method in evolutionary*
4
5 572 *biology*. Oxford Series in Ecology and Evolution. Oxford University Press, New York, 248
6
7
8 573 pp.
9
10 574
11
12 575 HAY, O. P. 1902. Bibliography and catalogue of the fossil Vertebrata of North America.
13
14 576 *Bulletin of the United States Geological Survey*, **179**, 1–868.
15
16
17 577
18
19 578 HINES, B. R., HOLLIS, C. J., ATKINS, C. B., BAKER, J. A., MORGANS, H. E. G. and
20
21 579 STRONG, P. C. 2017. Reduction of oceanic temperature gradients in the early Eocene
22
23 580 Southwest Pacific Ocean. *Palaeogeography, Palaeoclimatology, Palaeoecology*, **475**, 41–
24
25 581 54.
26
27
28 582
29
30 583 HOVESTADT, D. C. 2018. Reassessment and revision of the fossil Heterodontidae
31
32 584 (Chondrichthyes: Neoselachii) based on tooth morphology of extant taxa. *Palaeontos*, **30**, 3–
33
34 585 120.
35
36
37 586
38
39 587 HUMAN, B. A., OWEN, E. P., COMPAGNO, L. J., V. and HARLEY, E. H. 2006. Testing
40
41 588 morphologically based phylogenetic theories within the cartilaginous fishes with molecular
42
43 589 data, with special reference to the catshark family (Chondrichthyes; Scyliorhinidae) and the
44
45 590 interrelationships within them. *Molecular Phylogenetics and Evolution*, **39**, 384–391.
46
47
48 591
49
50 592 HUXLEY, T. H. 1880. On the application of the laws of evolution to the arrangement of the
51
52 593 Vertebrata and more particularly of the Mammalia. *Proceedings of the Zoological Society of*
53
54 594 *London*, **43**, 649–662.
55
56
57 595
58
59
60

- 596 INOUE, J. G., MIYA, M., LAM, K., TAY, B. H., DANKS, J. A., BELL, J., WALKER, T. I.,
597 VENKATESH, B. 2010. Evolutionary origin and phylogeny of the modern holocephalans
598 (Chondrichthyes: Chimaeriformes): a mitogenomic perspective. *Molecular Biology and*
599 *Evolution*, **27**, 2576–2586.
- 600
601 JACQUES, H., VAN WAES, H. 2012. Observations Concerning the Evolution and the
602 Parasystematic of all the living and fossil Heterodontiformes. *Géominpal Belgica*, **3**, 1–17.
- 603
604 KLUG, S. 2010. Monophyly, phylogeny and systematic position of the
605 †Synchodontiformes (Chondrichthyes, Neoselachii). *Zoological Scripta*, **39**, 37–49.
- 606
607 KOKEN, E. 1911. Pisces. In ZITTEL, K. A. (ed.). *Grundzüge der Paläontologie*.
608 *Volume 2*. München, Berlin, Oldenbourg, 142 pp.
- 609
610 KRIWET, J. 2008. A new species of extinct bullhead sharks, *Paracestracion viohli*
611 (Neoselachii, Heterodontiformes), from the Upper Jurassic of South Germany. *Acta*
612 *Geologica Polonica*, **58**, 235–241.
- 613
614 — and KLUG, S. 2004. Late Jurassic selachians (Chondrichthyes, Elasmobranchii)
615 from southern Germany: Re-evaluation on taxonomy and diversity. *Zitteliana*, **A44**:
616 67–95.
- 617
618 — and KLUG, S. 2008. Diversity and biogeography patterns of Late Jurassic
619 neoselachians (Chondrichthyes: Elasmobranchii). 55–70. In LONGBOTTOM, A. E.

- 620 and RICHTER, M. (eds). *Fishes and the Break-up of Pangaea*. Special Publications of
621 the Geological Society, London, 372 pp.
- 622
- 623 — KIESSLING, W. and KLUG, S. 2009a. Diversification trajectories and evolutionary
624 life-history traits in early sharks and batoids. *Proceedings of the Royal Society, Series B*,
625 **276**, 945–951.
- 626
- 627 — NUNN, E. V. and KLUG, S. 2009b. Neoselachians (Chondrichthyes, Elasmobranchii)
628 from the Lower and lower Upper Cretaceous of north-eastern Spain. *Zoological Journal of*
629 *the Linnean Society*, **155**, 316–347.
- 630
- 631 KUMAR, S., STECHER, G. and TAMURA, K. 2016. MEGA7: Molecular Evolutionary
632 Genetics Analysis version 7.0 for bigger datasets. *Molecular Biology and Evolution*, **33**,
633 1870–1874.
- 634
- 635 MADDISON, W. P. and MADDISON, D. R. 2018. Mesquite: a modular system for
636 evolutionary analysis. Version 3.51. <<http://www.mesquiteproject.org>>
- 637
- 638 MAIA, A. M. R., WILGA, C. A. D. and LAUDER, G. V. 2012. Biomechanics of locomotion
639 in sharks, rays, and chimeras. 125–151. In CARRIER, J. C., MUSICK, J. A. and
640 HEITHAUS, M. R. (eds.). *Biology of Sharks and Their Relatives II: Biodiversity, Adaptive*
641 *Physiology, and Conservation*. CRC Press Taylor & Francis Group, Boca Raton, Florida, 666
642 pp.
- 643

- 644 MAISEY, J. G. 1982. Fossil Hornshark Finspines (Elasmobranchii; Heterodontidae) with
645 Notes on a New Species (*Heterodontus tuberculatus*). *Neues Jahrbuch für Geologie und*
646 *Paläontologie, Abhandlungen*, **164**, 393–413.
- 647
- 648 — 2012. What is an ‘elasmobranch’? The impact of palaeontology in understanding
649 elasmobranch phylogeny and evolution. *Journal of Fish Biology*, **80**, 918–951.
- 650
- 651 — NAYLOR, G. J. P. and WARD, D. J. 2004. Mesozoic elasmobranchs, neoselachian
652 phylogeny and the rise of modern elasmobranch diversity. 17–56. In ARRATIA, G. and
653 TINTORI, A. (eds.), *Mesozoic Fishes 3 – Systematics, Paleoenvironments and Biodiversity*.
654 Dr Friedrich Pfeil Verlag, München, 649 pp.
- 655
- 656 MALLATT, J. and WINCHELL, C. J. 2007. Ribosomal RNA genes and deuterostome
657 phylogeny revisited: more cyclostomes, elasmobranchs, reptiles, and a brittle star. *Molecular*
658 *Phylogenetics and Evolution*, **43**, 1005–1022.
- 659
- 660 MOORE, G. T. and ROSS, C. A. 1994. Kimmeridgian-Tithonian (Late Jurassic) dinosaur
661 and ammonoid paleoecology from a paleoclimate simulation. *Canadian Society of*
662 *Petroleum Geologists Memoir*, **17**, 345–361.
- 663
- 664 NAYLOR, G. J. P., CAIRA, J. N., JENSEN, K. R. E., ROSANA, K. M., STRAUBE, N.
665 and LAKNER, C. 2012. Elasmobranch phylogeny: a mitochondrial estimate based on 595
666 species. 31–56. In CARRIER, J. C., MUSICK, J. A. and HEITHAUS, M. R. (eds.).
667 *Biology of Sharks and Their Relatives II: Biodiversity, Adaptive Physiology, and*
668 *Conservation*. CRC Press Taylor & Francis Group, Boca Raton, Florida, 666 pp.

- 669
- 670 POLLOM, R., BENNETT, R., EBERT, D. A., FERNANDO, S., JABADO, R. W.,
- 671 KUGURU, B., SAMOILYS, M. 2019. *Heterodontus ramalheira*. *The IUCN Red List of*
- 672 *Threatened Species*. < [http://dx.doi.org/10.2305/IUCN.UK.2019-](http://dx.doi.org/10.2305/IUCN.UK.2019-2.RLTS.T44614A140353520.en)
- 673 [2.RLTS.T44614A140353520.en](http://dx.doi.org/10.2305/IUCN.UK.2019-2.RLTS.T44614A140353520.en). Downloaded on 05 August 2019.
- 674
- 675 POWTER, D. 2007. Conservation biology of the Port Jackson shark, *Heterodontus*
- 676 *portusjacksoni*, in New South Wales. Unpublished PhD thesis, University of Newcastle,
- 677 [Australia](#), 466 pp.
- 678
- 679 REIF, W. -E. 1976. Morphogenesis, pattern formation and function of the dentition of
- 680 *Heterodontus* (Selachii). *Zoomorphologie*, **83**, 1–47.
- 681
- 682 SLATER, T. 2016. Sharks with question marks – impacts of a new fossil on
- 683 interrelationships of early bullhead sharks. 68–72. In McNAMARA, M. E. (ed.).
- 684 *Palaeontology Newsletter*. The Palaeontological Association, Durham, 88 pp.
- 685
- 686 — ASHBROOK, K. and KRIWET, J. 2019. [Evolutionary relationships among bullhead](#)
- 687 [sharks \(Chondrichthyes: Heterodontiformes\)](#). *Dryad Digital Repository*.
- 688 <https://doi.org/10.5061/dryad.6p4f83q>
- 689
- 690 SLUIJS, A., SCHOUTEN, S., PAGANI, M., WOLTERING, M., BRINKHUIS, H.,
- 691 DAMSTÈ, J. S. S., DICKENS, G. R., HUBER, M., REICHART, G. -J., STEIN, R.,
- 692 MATTHIESSEN, J., LOURENS, L. J., PEDENTCHOUK, N., BACKMAN, J., MORAN,

- 693 K. and EXPEDITION 302 SCIENTISTS. 2006. Subtropical Arctic Ocean temperatures
694 during the Palaeocene/Eocene thermal maximum. *Nature*, **441**, 610–613.
- 695
- 696 SORENSON, L., SANTINI, F. and ALFARO, M. E. 2014. The effect of habitat on modern
697 shark diversification. *Journal of Evolutionary Biology*, **27**, 1536–1548.
- 698
- 699 STRONG, W. R., Jr. 1989. Behavioral ecology of horn sharks, *Heterodontus francisci*, at
700 Santa Catalina Island, California, with emphasis on patterns of space utilization. Unpublished
701 MSc thesis, California State University, California, USA.
- 702
- 703 SWAFFORD, D. L. 2002. PAUP*. Phylogenetic Analysis Using Parsimony (*and
704 other methods). Version 4. Sinauer Associates, Sunderland, Massachusetts.
- 705
- 706 THIES, D. 1983. Jurazeitliche Neoselachier aus Deutschland und S-England (Jurassic
707 Neoselachians from Germany and S-England). *Courier Forschungsinstitut Senckenberg*, **58**,
708 1–116.
- 709
- 710 TYTELL, E. D. 2006. Median fin function in bluegill sunfish *Lepomis macrochirus*:
711 streamwise vortex structure during steady swimming. *Journal of Experimental Biology*, **209**,
712 1516–34.
- 713
- 714 WAGNER, J. A. 1857. Charakteristik neuer Arten von Knorpelfischen aus den
715 lithographischen Schieferen der Umgegend von Solnhofen. *Gelehrte Anzeigen der königlich
716 bayerischen Akademie der Wissenschaften*, **44**, 288–293.
- 717

WINCHELL, C. J., MARTIN, A. P. and MALLATT, J. 2004. Phylogeny of elasmobranchs based on LSU and SSU ribosomal RNA genes. *Molecular Phylogenetics and Evolution*, **31**, 214–224.

FIGURES

FIG. 1. Geological map of Eichstätt, Germany and surrounding areas. Stars indicate locality from which †*Paracestracion danieli* was excavated.

FIG. 2. Photographs of †*Paracestracion danieli*, a complete fossil subadult heterodontiform. A, UV image. B, counterpart. C, palatoquadrate and Meckel's cartilage with teeth in situ. D, anterior tooth. E, parasymphysial tooth. F, lateral teeth. G, root vascularization of anterior teeth. H, rostral denticles. I, cranial denticles. J, ventral denticles. K, denticles on leading edge of pelvic fin. Scale bars represent: 1 cm (A–C); 0.5 mm (D–K).

FIG. 3. A, anterior dorsal fin spine. B, posterior dorsal fin spine. C, dorsal denticles. D, dorsal thorn. Scale bars represent: 1 mm (A–B); 0.5 mm (C–D).

FIG. 4. Tooth morphology of anterior teeth throughout ontogeny for †extinct and extant heterodontids. The darker grey region denotes the tooth root for †*P. falcifer*. Adapted from Reif (1976). All scale bars represent 1 mm.

FIG 5. PCA of allometrically scaled distance measurements taken from extinct and extant heterodontids. Ellipses, 95% confidence interval. Adapted from Slater (2016).

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

742 FIG 6. Morphometric cladogram of extinct and extant heterodontids. Labels on nodes indicate
743 bootstrap estimates for ACCTRAN and DELTRAN optimization (the latter in bold). Crosses
744 indicate extinct species. TL, total length; RI, retention index; CI, consistency index.

745
746 FIG 7. A molecular, maximum likelihood phylogeny of extant Heterodontiformes. Bootstrap
747 values and divergence times are indicated (the latter in bold).

748
749 TABLE 1. Standing diversity of extinct and extant heterodontiforms through time. Raw data
750 and stratigraphic information taken from Reif (1976) and Hovestadt (2018) are presented with
751 respect to the authors' proposed dental morphotypes. CI, confidence interval; N, number of
752 species.




FIG. 1. Geological map of Eichstätt, Germany and surrounding areas. Stars indicate locality from which *†Paracestracion danieli* was excavated.

160x75mm (600 x 600 DPI)




FIG. 2. Photographs of †*Paracestracion danieli*, a complete fossil subadult heterodontiform. A, UV image. B, counterpart. C, palatoquadrate and Meckel's cartilage with teeth in situ. D, anterior tooth. E, parasymphysial tooth. F, lateral teeth. G, root vascularization of anterior teeth. H, rostral denticles. I, cranial denticles. J, ventral denticles. K, denticles on leading edge of pelvic fin. Scale bars represent: 1 cm (A–C); 0.5 mm (D–K).

160x185mm (600 x 600 DPI)




FIG. 3. A, anterior dorsal fin spine. B, posterior dorsal fin spine. C, dorsal denticles. D, dorsal thorn. Scale bars represent: 1 mm (A–B); 0.5 mm (C–D).

160x62mm (600 x 600 DPI)




FIG. 4. Tooth morphology of anterior teeth throughout ontogeny for †extinct and extant heterodontids. The darker grey region denotes the tooth root for †*P. falcifer*. Adapted from Reif (1976). All scale bars represent 1 mm.

80x115mm (600 x 600 DPI)




FIG 5. PCA of allometrically scaled distance measurements taken from extinct and extant heterodontids. Ellipses, 95% confidence interval. Adapted from Slater (2016).

109x75mm (600 x 600 DPI)




FIG 6. Morphometric cladogram of extinct and extant heterodontids. Labels on nodes indicate bootstrap estimates for ACCTRAN and DELTRAN optimization (the latter in bold). Crosses indicate extinct species. TL, total length; RI, retention index; CI, consistency index.

110x75mm (600 x 600 DPI)

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

	Morphotype			N		Total species (%)	Upper and lower limits of 95% CI (%)
	1	2	?	Epoch	Series		
Recent	3	6		9	9	15.8	-8.98/+10.05
Pliocene	1	1		2	7	12.3	-7.82/+9.19
Miocene	1	4		5			
Oligocene	1			1	10	17.5	-9.33/+10.46
Eocene	4	3		7			
Palaeocene	1	1		2			
Maastrichtian	1	1	2	3	15	26.3	-11.06/+11.84
Campanian	1			1			
Santonian	1			1			
Coniacian							
Turonian		1		1			
Cenomanian	4	4	1	9			
Aptian/Albian		1	1	2	5	8.8	-6.72/+7.97
Barremian			1	1			
Hauterivian							
Valanginian			2	2			
Berriasian							
Late Jurassic				6	6	10.5	-7.37/+8.67
Middle Jurassic				4	4	7	-5.89/+7.39
Early Jurassic				1	1	1.8	-5.89/+7.39
Total species					57		